

DEFORMING A HYPERSURFACE BY GAUSS CURVATURE AND SUPPORT FUNCTION

MOHAMMAD N. IVAKI

ABSTRACT. We study the motion of smooth, strictly convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ expanding in the direction of their normal vector field with speed depending on Gauss curvature and support function.

1. INTRODUCTION

The setting of this paper is n -dimensional Euclidean space, $\mathbb{R}^n$. A compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with non-empty interior is called a *convex body*. The set of convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{K}^n$. Write $\mathcal{K}_e^n$ for the set of origin-symmetric convex bodies and $\mathcal{K}_0^n$ for the set of convex bodies whose interiors contain the origin. Also write $\mathcal{F}^n$, $\mathcal{F}_0^n$, and $\mathcal{F}_e^n$, respectively, for the set of smooth (C^∞ -smooth), strictly convex bodies in $\mathcal{K}^n$, $\mathcal{K}_0^n$, and $\mathcal{K}_e^n$.

The unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by B and its boundary is denoted by $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. We write $\nu : \partial K \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for the Gauss map of ∂K , the boundary of $K \in \mathcal{F}^n$. That is, at each point $x \in \partial K$, $\nu(x)$ is the unit outwards normal at x .

Assume that φ is a positive, smooth function on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Let $F_0 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smooth parametrization of ∂K_0 where $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$. In this paper, among other things, we study the long-time behavior of a family of convex bodies $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0^n$ given by smooth maps $F : M \times [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies the initial value problem

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t F(x, t) = \varphi(\nu(x, t)) \frac{(F(x, t) \cdot \nu(x, t))^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}(x, t)} \nu(x, t), \quad F(\cdot, 0) = F_0(\cdot).$$

Here $F(M, t) = \partial K_t$, and $\mathcal{K}(\cdot, t)$ is the Gauss curvature of $F(M, t)$. Moreover, T is the maximal time for which the solution exists.

The support function of $K \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$ as a function on the unit sphere is defined by

$$h_K(u) := \nu^{-1}(u) \cdot u$$

for each $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. All information about the hypersurface, except for parametrization, is contained in the support function. It easy to see that as $\{K_t\}$ moves according to (1.1), then $h : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h(\cdot, t) := h_{K_t}(\cdot)$ evolves by

$$(1.2) \quad \partial_t h(u, t) = \varphi(u) \frac{h^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}(u, t).$$

A self-similar solution of this flow satisfies

$$(1.3) \quad h^{1-p} \det(\bar{\nabla}^2 h + \text{Id } h) = \frac{c}{\varphi},$$

for some positive constant c . Here $\bar{\nabla}$ is the covariant derivative on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ endowed with an orthonormal frame.

When $p = 2$, $\varphi \equiv 1$, flow (1.2), among other flows, was studied by Schnürer [47] in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and by Gerhardt [23] in higher dimensions. Both works rely on the reflection principle of Chow and Gulliver [19], and McCoy [40]. Their result is as follows: the normalized flow evolves any smooth strictly convex body in the C^∞ -topology to an origin-centered ball. When $p = -n$, $\varphi \equiv 1$, the flow is a member of a family of flows, p -centro affine normal flows, which was introduced by Stancu [48]. In $\mathbb{R}^2$ and for $p = -2$, $\varphi \equiv 1$, a “dual” flow to (1.2) (see Lemma 2.3) was studied by the author [30] with an application to the stability of the Busemann-Petty centroid inequality in the plane. For $p > 2$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ and in $\mathbb{R}^n$, it follows from Chow-Gulliver [19, Theorem 3.1] (see also Tsai [50, Example 1]) that (1.2) evolves any smooth strictly convex body in the C^1 -topology to an origin-centered ball. See also Chow-Tsai [20, 21, 22] for discussion of the expansion of convex hypersurfaces by non-homogeneous functions of principal curvatures and Gauss curvature. Moreover, in $\mathbb{R}^2$ the following theorems can be obtained by using Andrews’ results. Let us set $\tilde{K}_t := (V(B)/V(K_t))^{1/n} K_t$.

Theorem A1. *Let $-2 \leq p < \infty$, $p \neq 1$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ and assume that $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^2$ satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{u}{h_{K_0}(u)^{1-p}} d\sigma(u) = 0$. There exists a unique solution $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0^2$ of flow (1.2) such that $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$ converges in the C^∞ -topology to the unit disk if $p > -2$ and to an origin-centered ellipse if $p = -2$.*

Theorem A2. *Let $-2 < p < \infty$, $p \neq 1$. Let φ be a positive, smooth, even function on $\mathbb{S}^1$ i.e., $\varphi(u) = \varphi(-u)$. Assume that $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_e^2$. There exists a unique solution $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_e^2$ of flow (1.2) such that $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$ converges in the C^∞ -topology to an origin-symmetric strictly convex, smooth solution of (1.3).*

Theorem A3. *Let $-2 < p \leq -1$, and $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^2$ satisfy $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{u}{\varphi(u)h_{K_0}(u)^{1-p}} d\sigma(u) = 0$. Then there exists a unique solution $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0^2$ of flow (1.2) such that $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$ converges in the C^∞ -topology to a positive strictly convex, smooth solution of (1.3).*

Remark. *These theorems can be obtained from Andrews’ results [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]: If $p < 1$, then one needs Andrews’ results about asymptotic behavior of shrinking flows by positive powers of curvature ($\partial_t h = -\psi K^{\frac{1}{1-p}}$), but when $p > 1$ one needs Andrews’ results on asymptotic behavior of expanding flows by negative powers of curvature ($\partial_t h = \psi K^{\frac{1}{1-p}}$). We observe that the evolution equation of $\psi K^{\frac{1}{1-p}}$ in either case satisfies, up to a positive constant, (1.2) with $\varphi = \psi^{p-1}$. Existence of solutions to the Minkowski problem lets us reverse this procedure, provided K_0 satisfies the integral identity $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{u}{\varphi h_{K_0}^{1-p}} d\sigma = 0$. This argument is invalid if $n \geq 3$ or $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{u}{\varphi h_{K_0}^{1-p}} d\sigma \neq 0$. See also S. Angenent, J.J.L. Velázquez, Y.-C. Lin, T.-S. Lin, C.-C. Poon, and D.-H. Tsai [9, 10, 49, 34, 35, 43, 44] for several beautiful results about the blow-up behavior of immersed, smooth, convex, closed plane curves with rotation index $m \geq 1$ evolving by (1.2).*

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 3$, $p = -n$ and $\varphi \equiv 1$. Assume that $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$ has its Santaló point at the origin, e.g., $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{h_{K_0}(u)^{n+1}} d\sigma(u) = 0$. Then there exists a unique solution $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0^n$ of flow (1.2) such that $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$ converges in the C^∞ -topology to an origin-centered ellipsoid.*

As a corollary of this theorem, we prove an inequality of Lutwak [37] (stronger than the Blaschke-Santaló inequality). See Theorem 10.1 for the statement.

The next theorem fills in the gap $p = 1$ in the statement of Theorem A2.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $p = 1$, φ be a positive, smooth, even function on $\mathbb{S}^1$ and $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_e^2$. Then there exists a unique solution $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0^2$ of flow (1.2) such that $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$ converges in the C^∞ -topology to an origin-symmetric strictly convex, smooth solution of (1.3).*

Let $F_0 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smooth parametrization of ∂K_0 where $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$. Consider convex bodies $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0^n$ given by the smooth embeddings $F : M \times [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that solve the initial value problem

$$(1.4) \quad \partial_t F(x, t) = -\frac{\mathcal{K}(x, t)}{(F(x, t) \cdot \nu(x, t))^n} \nu(x, t), \quad F(\cdot, 0) = F_0(\cdot).$$

Then, as K_t moves according to (1.4), $h : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h(\cdot, t) := h_{K_t}(\cdot)$ evolves by

$$(1.5) \quad \partial_t h(u, t) = -\frac{\mathcal{K}}{h^n}(u, t).$$

This flow was introduced by Stancu [48] (p centro-affine normal flows for $p = \infty$). We will prove the following theorem about the asymptotic behavior of flow (1.5).

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$ has its centroid at the origin. Then there exists a unique solution $\{K_t\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0^n$ of flow (1.5) such that $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$ converges in the C^∞ -topology to an origin-centered ellipsoid.*

Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 result from finding a family of entropy functionals B_p^φ (see Definition 3.9), a finding that was inspired by the definition of curvature image due to Petty [42] and an inequality of Lutwak [37]; see Theorem 10.1. In the course of proving our main theorems, we also prove Theorems A1, A2 and A3 for a subsequence of times. In Section 8.1, we give a convex-geometric argument to obtain the asymptotic shapes in Theorems 1.1, 1.3, A1, A2, and A3; the argument does not rely on uniform higher order regularity estimates for the normalized solutions, and it employs only entropy functionals B_p^φ . In Section 9, we will prove Theorem 1.2 and discuss the C^∞ convergence in Theorems A1, A2, and A3. In Section 10, we present a few applications of the flow (1.1), such as a direct proof of Lutwak's inequality 1986.

2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

2.1. Differential Geometry. The matrix of the radii of the curvature of ∂K is denoted by $\mathbf{r} = [\mathbf{r}_{ij}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1}$ and the entries of $\mathbf{r}$ are considered as functions on the unit sphere. They can be expressed in terms of the support function and its covariant derivatives as $\mathbf{r}_{ij} := \bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}_j h + h \bar{g}_{ij}$, where $[\bar{g}_{ij}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1}$ is the standard metric on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $\bar{\nabla}$ is the standard Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. The Gauss curvature of ∂K is denoted by $\mathcal{K}$, and as a function on ∂K , it is also related to the support function of the convex body by

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{K} \circ \nu^{-1}} := S_{n-1} = \det_{\bar{g}}[\bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}_j h + \bar{g}_{ij} h] := \frac{\det[\mathbf{r}_{ij}]}{\det[\bar{g}_{ij}]}.$$

In the sequel, for simplicity, we usually denote $\mathcal{K} \circ \nu^{-1}$ by $\mathcal{K}$. The principal radii of curvature $\{\lambda_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n-1}$ are the eigenvalues of $[\mathbf{r}_{ij}]$ with respect to $[\bar{g}_{ij}]$. Moreover, we write $[w_{ij}]$ for the second fundamental form of ∂K and the principal curvatures

are the eigenvalues of $[w_{ij}]$ with respect to $[g_{ij}]$ which we shall denote by $\{\kappa_i\} = \{1/\lambda_i \circ \nu\}$.

2.2. Convex Geometry. We will start by defining the polar body.

Polar body: The polar body, K^* , of convex body K with the origin of $\mathbb{R}^n$ in its interior is the convex body defined as

$$K^* = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x \cdot y \leq 1 \text{ for all } y \in K\}.$$

The Blaschke-Santaló inequality states that

$$\min_{x \in \text{int } K} V(K)V((K-x)^*) \leq \omega_n^2.$$

Equality holds exclusively for ellipsoids. The point for which the above minimum is achieved is called the Santaló point, and it will be denoted as $e_{-n}(K)$. In what follows, we will furnish all geometric quantities associated with K^* with $*$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$. Suppose that $0 < a \leq h_K \leq b < \infty$ and $0 < c \leq \kappa_i \leq d < \infty$. Then*

$$c_1 \leq \kappa_i^* \leq c_2,$$

for $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending only on a, b, c, d .

Proof. In general, parameterizing ∂K as a graph over the unit sphere with the corresponding radial distance function $r : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can write the metric $[g_{ij}]$ and its inverse $[g^{ij}]$, the second fundamental form $[w_{ij}]$, and $[\mathfrak{r}_{ij}^*]$ in terms of r and whose spatial derivatives as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & g_{ij} = r^2 \bar{g}_{ij} + \bar{\nabla}_i r \bar{\nabla}_j r; \\ (2) \quad & g^{ij} = \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\bar{g}^{ij} - \frac{\bar{\nabla}^i r \bar{\nabla}^j r}{r^2 + |\bar{\nabla} r|^2} \right); \\ (3) \quad & w_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 + |\bar{\nabla} r|^2}} (-r \bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}_j r + 2 \bar{\nabla}_i r \bar{\nabla}_j r + r^2 \bar{g}_{ij}); \\ (4) \quad & \mathfrak{r}_{ij}^* = \bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}_j \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r} \bar{g}_{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{r^2 + |\bar{\nabla} r|^2}}{r^3} w_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

The proofs of (1)–(3) can be found in [54], and (4) follows from the fact that $\frac{1}{r}$ is the support function of K^* (see also Oliker-Simon [53, Identities (7.6), (7.31)]). We apply these formulas to K^* . From (2) and (4) we get $[\mathfrak{r}_{ij}][g^{*ij}] = \frac{\sqrt{r^{*2} + |\bar{\nabla} r|^2}}{r^{*3}} [w_{in}^* g^{*nj}]$. To prove the claim, we have only to consider points for which the gradient of the radial function r^* does not vanish. Around such a point, we introduce an orthonormal frame $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $e_1 = \frac{\bar{\nabla} r^*}{|\bar{\nabla} r^*|}$. Then $\bar{\nabla} r^* = (|\bar{\nabla} r^*|, 0, \dots, 0)$. Thus, in such a frame we may express $[\mathfrak{r}_{ij}][g^{*ij}]$ as follows:

$$(2.1) \quad [\mathfrak{r}_{ij}][g^{*ij}] = [\mathfrak{r}_{ij}] \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r^{*2} + |\bar{\nabla} r|^2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r^{*2}} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{1}{r^{*2}} \end{pmatrix} := AB.$$

The eigenvalues of A are $\{\lambda_i\}$, the eigenvalues of B are $\{\frac{1}{r^{*2} + |\bar{\nabla} r|^2}, \frac{1}{r^{*2}}\}$, and the eigenvalues of AB are $\{\frac{\sqrt{r^{*2} + |\bar{\nabla} r|^2}}{r^{*3}} \kappa_i^*\}$. We may assume that $\kappa_1^* \leq \kappa_2^* \leq \dots \leq \kappa_{n-1}^*$ and $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{n-1}$. It follows (for example, see Corollary III.4.6 [11]) that the eigenvalues of AB are bounded above by $\frac{\lambda_{n-1}}{r^{*2}}$. Thus, we get an upper bound

on κ_{n-1}^* in terms of a, b, c . Moreover, from the identity $\frac{h_K^{n+1}}{\mathcal{K}}(x)\frac{h_{K^*}^{n+1}}{\mathcal{K}^*}(x^*) = 1$ where $x \in \partial K$, and $x^* \in \partial K^*$ satisfies $x \cdot x^* = 1$ ¹, it follows that $l < \mathcal{K}^*$ for some positive finite number depending only on a, b, d . Therefore, since κ_{n-1}^* is bounded above, the lower bound on κ_1^* follows. $\square$

Remark 2.2. Explicit equality between the elementary symmetric functions of principal curvatures of K^* and the principal radii of curvature of K is given by Hug [28, Theorem 5.1] in a general setting in which the convex body might not be smooth. Moreover, [28, Corollary 5.1] deduces an inequality from which lower and upper bounds for the principal curvatures (and not only for their elementary symmetric functions) can be deduced.

Lemma 2.3. *As K_t evolve by (1.2), their polars K_t^* evolve as follows:*

$$\partial_t h^* = -\varphi \left(\frac{h^* u + \bar{\nabla} h^*}{\sqrt{h^{*2} + |\bar{\nabla} h^*|^2}} \right) \left(\frac{(h^{*2} + |\bar{\nabla} h^*|^2)^{\frac{n+p}{2}}}{h^{*n}} \right) \mathcal{K}^*, \quad h^*(\cdot, t) := h_{K_t^*}(\cdot).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one in [29, Theorem 2.2]. $\square$

Minkowski's mixed volume inequality and curvature function: A convex body is said to be of class C_+^k for some $k \geq 2$, if its boundary hypersurface is k -times continuously differentiable, in the sense of differential geometry, and if the Gauss map $\nu : \partial K \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is well-defined and a C^{k-1} -diffeomorphism.

Let K, L be two convex bodies and $0 < a < \infty$. The Minkowski sum $K + aL$ is defined as $h_{K+aL} = h_K + ah_L$ and the mixed volume $V_1(K, L)$ of K and L is defined by

$$V_1(K, L) = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{a \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(K + aL) - V(K)}{a}.$$

A fundamental fact is that corresponding to each convex body K , there is a unique Borel measure S_K on the unit sphere such that

$$V_1(K, L) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) dS_K(u)$$

for each convex body L . The measure S_K is called the surface area measure of K . Recall that if K is C_+^2 , then S_K is absolutely continuous with respect to σ , and the Radon-Nikodym derivative $dS_K(u)/d\sigma(u)$ defined on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is the reciprocal Gauss curvature of ∂K at the point of ∂K whose outer normal is u . For $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$V(K) = V_1(K, K) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) dS_K(u).$$

Of significant importance in convex geometry is the Minkowski mixed volume inequality. Minkowski's mixed volume inequality states that for $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$V_1(K, L)^n \geq V(K)^{n-1} V(L).$$

Equality holds, if and only if K and L are homothetic.

A convex body K is said to have a positive continuous curvature function f_K , defined on the unit sphere, provided that for every convex body L

$$V_1(K, L) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L f_K d\sigma,$$

¹This identity can be proved by taking the determinant of both sides of (2.1). See also Hug [27, Theorem 2.2] for a proof of this identity for non-smooth, convex hypersurfaces.

where σ is the spherical Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. A convex body can have at most one curvature function; see [12, p. 115]. If K is of class C_+^2 , then the curvature function is the reciprocal Gauss curvature of ∂K transplanted to $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ via the Gauss map.

3. ENTROPY POINTS AND ENTROPY FUNCTIONALS

Write $\mathcal{S}^+$ for the set of positive, smooth functions on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and write $\mathcal{S}_e^+$ for the set of positive, smooth, even functions on the unit sphere. That is, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$, if $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$ and $\varphi(u) = \varphi(-u)$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a unique point $e_p(K) \in \text{int } K$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in K} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - x \cdot u)^p d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma & \text{if } 1 < p < \infty \\ \max_{x \in K} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - x \cdot u)^p d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma & \text{if } 0 < p < 1 \\ \min_{x \in \text{int } K} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\log(h_K(u) - x \cdot u) d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\log(h_K(u) - e_0 \cdot u) d\sigma & \text{if } p = 0 \\ \min_{x \in \text{int } K} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - x \cdot u)^p d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma & \text{if } -n \leq p < 0. \end{cases}$$

Additionally, e_p is characterized by $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{(h_K(u) - e_p(K) \cdot u)^{1-p}} d\sigma(u) = 0$.

Moreover, let $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$. Then there exists a unique point, $e_p^\varphi(K)$, in the interior of K such that

$$\min_{x \in \text{int } K} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_K(u) - x \cdot u)^p}{\varphi(u)} d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_K(u) - e_p^\varphi \cdot u)^p}{\varphi(u)} d\sigma.$$

Additionally, e_p^φ is characterized by $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{\varphi(u)(h_K(u) - e_p^\varphi(K) \cdot u)^{1-p}} d\sigma(u) = 0$.

Proof. Existence and uniqueness of a point in K for each of the above minimizations and maximizations follow from the strict concavity or strict convexity of the corresponding functional and compactness of K . The proof of $e_p \in \text{int } K$ follows exactly the one given by Guan and Ni [24, Lemmas 2.3, 2.4]. For completeness, we present it here. We shall consider the case $p \neq 0$. Suppose, on the contrary, that $e_p(K)$ is on the boundary of K and ν is the outer normal at e_p . By Busemann's theorem [13, Theorem 1.12], there is a rectangular coordinate system $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ such that e_p is the origin, $(0, \dots, 0, 1) = \nu$, and the segment $[\vec{0}, -ty_n]$ is contained in $\text{int } K$ for small $t > 0$. In view of this fact, we may then assume that in the standard coordinate system of $\mathbb{R}^n$ one has $e_p = \vec{0}$, $\nu = (0, \dots, 1)$, and K lies below the hyperplane $\nu^\perp$. Take an arbitrary point $u^+ = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$, with $u_n \geq 0$, and define $u^- = (u_1, \dots, -u_n)$. For a fixed u^+ define $i(u^+)$, the point on the boundary of K that $h_K(u^+) = u^+ \cdot i(u^+)$. We have

$$h_K(u^-) \geq u^- \cdot i(u^+) \geq u^+ \cdot i(u^+) = h_K(u^+).$$

Moreover, $h_K((0, \dots, -1)) > 0$ and $h_K((0, \dots, 1)) = 0$. So the above inequality must be strict for a set of positive measure. Define $\bar{h}(u) = h_K(u) + su_n$, and note that $\bar{h}$ is positive for all u , provided $(0, \dots, -s) \in \text{int } K$, which is the case if

$0 < s < t$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{sgn} \left(\frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{h}^p d\sigma \right) \right) &= \operatorname{sgn} \left(p \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K^{p-1}(u) (u \cdot \nu) d\sigma \right) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn} \left(p \int_{\{u_n > 0\} \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \left(h_K^{p-1}(u^+) - h_K^{p-1}(u^-) \right) u_n d\sigma \right) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn}(p(1-p)). \end{aligned}$$

To prove that $e_p^\varphi \in \operatorname{int} K$, notice that when $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial K} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_K(u) - x \cdot u)^p}{\varphi(u)} d\sigma = +\infty,$$

while by the Blaschke-Santaló inequality, the infimum is finite. $\square$

Remark 3.2. In the sequel, we will always exclude case $p = 1$, unless we are working with origin-symmetric bodies.

Definition 3.3. For $-n \leq p < \infty$, $p \neq 1$, $e_p(K)$ is the unique point in $\operatorname{int} K$ that satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{(h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^{1-p}} d\sigma(u) = 0.$$

When $n \leq p \leq -n+1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$, $e_p^\varphi(K)$ is the unique point in $\operatorname{int} K$ that satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{\varphi(u) (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^{1-p}} d\sigma(u) = 0.$$

For $-n \leq p < \infty$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$, we define the point $e_p^\varphi(K)$ to be the origin.

Remark 3.4. In general, for $-n+1 < p < \infty$, a minimizing or maximizing point of $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_K(u) - x \cdot u)^p}{\varphi(u)} d\sigma$ may fail to be in the interior of K .

Definition 3.5. Let $-n \leq p < \infty$. Since K satisfies $\int \frac{u}{(h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^{1-p}} d\sigma = 0$, the indefinite σ -integral of $(h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^{p-1}$ satisfies the sufficiency condition of Minkowski's existence theorem in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, there exists a unique convex body (up to translations), denoted by $\Lambda_p K$, which has a surface area measure that satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad dS_{\Lambda_p K} = \left(\frac{V(K)}{\frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K-e_p}^p d\sigma} \right) \frac{1}{h_{K-e_p}^{1-p}} d\sigma,$$

see Theorem 4 of [16]. In addition, when $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$, or $-n \leq p < \infty$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$, we define $\Lambda_p^\varphi K$ as a convex body with positive curvature function

$$(3.2) \quad f_{\Lambda_p^\varphi K} = \left(\frac{V(K)}{\frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K-e_p^\varphi}^p}{\varphi} d\sigma} \right) \frac{1}{\varphi h_{K-e_p^\varphi}^{1-p}}.$$

Notice that when $p = 1$, $\Lambda_1^\varphi K$ is a ball. We point out that our definition of Λ_p differs considerably from the usual definition of Lutwak (see [46, p. 554]), but agrees with Petty's definition when $p = -n$ [42]. In the sequel, we will assume, after translation, that $\Lambda_p K$ and $\Lambda_p^\varphi K$ have the same centroids as K . That is, $\operatorname{cent}(K) = \operatorname{cent}(\Lambda_p K) = \operatorname{cent}(\Lambda_p^\varphi K)$.

Remark 3.6. From the definition of the mixed volume, we have $V_1(\Lambda_p K, K) = V(K)$. As a result, by the Minkowski mixed volume inequality $V(K) \geq V(\Lambda_p K)$. Equality holds if and only if $\Lambda_p K = K$. Using Minkowski's mixed volume inequality once more, we get

$$(3.3) \quad V_1(K, \Lambda_p K) \geq V(\Lambda_p K).$$

Here the equality holds if and only if $\Lambda_p K = K$. Similarly if $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$, or $-n \leq p < \infty$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$, we get

$$(3.4) \quad V_1(K, \Lambda_p^\varphi K) \geq V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K),$$

and the equality holds if and only if $\Lambda_p^\varphi K = K$.

Remark 3.7. If $K \in \mathcal{F}^n$, then by definition K is of class C_+^∞ , so $h_K \in C^\infty$. In fact, by definition of the class C_+^∞ , the Gauss map ν is a diffeomorphism of class C^∞ and so $h_K(u) = \nu^{-1}(u) \cdot u$ is C^∞ . In this case, since $\Lambda_p^\varphi K$, $\Lambda_p K$ are solutions of the Minkowski problem with positive C^∞ prescribed data, $\Lambda_p^\varphi K$ and $\Lambda_p K$ are of class C_+^∞ ; see Cheng-Yau [16, Theorem 1].

Definition 3.8.

$$\mathcal{A}_p(K) := \begin{cases} V(K) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}} & \text{if } -n \leq p < \infty \text{ \& } p \neq 0 \\ V(K) \exp \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\log(h_K(u) - e_0 \cdot u) d\sigma}{\omega_n} \right) & \text{if } p = 0. \end{cases}$$

For $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$, or $-n \leq p < \infty$, $p \neq 0$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$,

$$\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(K) := V(K) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p}{\varphi(u)} d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}}.$$

For $p = 0$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$,

$$\mathcal{A}_0^\varphi(K) := V(K) \exp \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\frac{\log h_K}{\varphi} d\sigma}{\omega_n} \right).$$

Next, we introduce a new family of entropy functionals.

Definition 3.9. $\mathcal{B}_p(K) := \frac{V(K)^{n-1} \mathcal{A}_p(K)}{V(\Lambda_p K)^{n-1}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(K) := \frac{V(K)^{n-1} \mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(K)}{V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K)^{n-1}}$.

Remark 3.10. Note that we have $\mathcal{A}_p(K) \leq \mathcal{B}_p(K)$, and $\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(K) \leq \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(K)$. It will be shown that functionals $\frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p}{1-p}$, $\frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi}{1-p}$, $p \neq 1$ are strictly increasing unless K_t solves (in the Alexandrov sense) (1.3). From this point of view, they will play roles in deducing the asymptotic shapes under the flows; see (5.1).

4. LONG-TIME EXISTENCE

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\{K_t\}$ be a solution of (1.2) on $[0, t_0]$. If $c_1 \leq h_{K_t} \leq c_2$ on $[0, t_0]$, then $\mathcal{K} \geq \frac{1}{a+bt - \frac{n-1}{n}}$ on $(0, t_0]$, where a and b depend only on c_1, c_2, p, φ . In particular, $\mathcal{K} \geq c_4$ on $[0, t_0]$ for some positive finite number that depends on the initial data, c_1, c_2, p, φ and is independent of t_0 .*

Proof. Applying Tso's trick to the evolution equation for polar bodies, Lemma 2.3, as in the proof of [29, Lemma 4.3] gives $\mathcal{K} \geq \frac{1}{a+bt - \frac{n-1}{n}}$ on $(0, t_0]$. It also follows from the proof of [29, Lemma 4.3] that a and b depend only on c_1, c_2, p, φ . The lower bound for $\mathcal{K}$ on $[0, \delta]$ for a small enough $\delta > 0$ follows from the short-time

existence of the flow. The lower bound for $\mathcal{K}$ on $[\delta, t_0]$ follows from the inequality $\mathcal{K} \geq \frac{1}{a+b\delta^{-\frac{n-1}{n}}}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\{K_t\}$ be a solution of (1.2) on $[0, t_0]$. If $0 < c_2 \leq h_{K_t} \leq c_1 < \infty$ on $[0, t_0]$, then $\mathcal{K} \leq c_3 < \infty$ on $[0, t_0]$. Here c_3 depends on the initial data, c_1, c_2, p, φ and t_0 .*

Proof. We apply Tso's trick to the speed of (1.2) as in the proof of [29, Lemma 4.1] to get

$$\partial_t \frac{\varphi \frac{h^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}}{2c_1 - h} \geq -c' \left(\frac{\varphi \frac{h^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}}{2c_1 - h} \right)^2,$$

where $c' > 0$ depends only on c_1, c_2, p, φ . Therefore,

$$\frac{\varphi \frac{h^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}}{2c_1 - h}(t, u) \geq \frac{1}{c't + 1 / \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{\varphi \frac{h^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}}{2c_1 - h}(0, u)} \geq \frac{1}{c't_0 + 1 / \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{\varphi \frac{h^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}}{2c_1 - h}(0, u)}.$$

The corresponding claim for the Gauss curvature follows. $\square$

These last two lemmas are enough to establish the long-time existence of solutions to (1.2) when the initial body is in $\mathcal{F}_0^2$.

Lemma 4.3. *If $-2 \leq p < 2$ and $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^2$, then the lifespan of the solution to (1.2) is finite, and infinite when $p \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let $-2 \leq p < 2$. We can put a tiny disk centered at the origin inside K_0 . This disk flows to infinity in finite time, so by comparison principle K_t cannot exist eternally. For $p > 2$, consider an origin-centered disk B_R , such that $K_0 \subset B_R$. Then $K_t \subset B_{R(t)}$, where $R(t) = ((\max h_{K_0})^{p-2} + t(p-2) \max \varphi)^{\frac{1}{p-2}}$. Thus, for any finite time t_0 , $\{h_{K_t}\}$ remains uniformly bounded on $[0, t_0]$. So by Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 the evolution equation (1.2) is uniformly parabolic on $[0, t_0]$ and bounds on higher derivatives of the support function follow. Therefore, we can extend the solution smoothly past time t_0 . When $p = 2$ the argument is similar. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *Let $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^2$. Then the solution to (1.2) satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \max h_{K_t} = \infty$.*

Proof. First, let $p > 2$. In this case the flow exists on $[0, \infty)$. For this reason, we may insert a tiny disk inside of K_0 and use the comparison principle to prove the claim: Consider an origin centered disk B_r , such that $K_0 \supseteq B_r$. Then $K_t \supseteq B_{r(t)}$, where $r(t) = ((\min h_{K_0})^{p-2} + t(p-2) \min \varphi)^{\frac{1}{p-2}}$ and $B_{r(t)}$ expands to infinity as t approaches ∞ . When $p = 2$ the argument is similar. Second, if $p < 2$, then the flow exists only on a finite time interval. If $\max h_{K_t} < \infty$, then by Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, the evolution equation (1.2) is uniformly parabolic on $[0, T)$. Thus, the result of Krylov and Safonov [33] and standard parabolic theory allow us to extend the solution smoothly past time T , contradicting its maximality. $\square$

To prove the long-time existence of solutions to (1.2) when $n \geq 3$ and $p = -n$, the next step is to obtain lower and upper bounds on the principal curvatures. To this aim, we will use the evolution equation of $S_1^* := \sum \lambda_i^*$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $n \geq 3$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $p = -n$. Assume that $\{K_t\}$ is a solution of (1.2) on $[0, t_0]$. If $c_2 \leq h_{K_t} \leq c_1$ and $c_4 \leq \mathcal{K} \leq c_3$ on $[0, t_0]$, then*

$$\frac{1}{C(1+t^{-(n-2)})^{n-2}} \leq \kappa_i \leq C(1+t^{-(n-2)})$$

on $(0, t_0]$, for some $C > 0$ independent of K_0 and depending on c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, p . In particular, κ_i are uniformly bounded above and stay uniformly away from zero on $[0, t_0]$.

Proof. Since $c_2 \leq h_{K_t} \leq c_1$, we have $c'_2 \leq h^*(\cdot, t) = h_{K_t^*} \leq c'_1$. Moreover, since $c_4 \leq \mathcal{K} \leq c_3$ on $[0, t_0]$, in view of the identity $\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{h^{n+1}}\right)(x) \left(\frac{\mathcal{K}^*}{h^{*n+1}}\right)(x^*) = 1$, we get $c'_4 \leq \mathcal{K}^* \leq c'_3$ on $[0, t_0]$. Now we calculate the evolution equation of $\mathfrak{r}_{ij}^*$ using Lemma 2.3. Set $\rho := \frac{(h^{*2} + |\bar{\nabla} h^*|^2)^{\frac{n+p}{2}}}{h^{*n}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathfrak{r}_{ij}^* &= \rho S_{n-1}^{*-2} (S_{n-1}^*)'_{kl} \bar{\nabla}_k \bar{\nabla}_l \mathfrak{r}_{ij}^* - 2\rho S_{n-1}^{*-3} \bar{\nabla}_i S_{n-1}^* \bar{\nabla}_j S_{n-1}^* \\ &\quad + \rho S_{n-1}^{*-2} (S_{n-1}^*)''_{kl;mn} \bar{\nabla}_i \mathfrak{r}_{kl}^* \bar{\nabla}_j \mathfrak{r}_{mn}^* \\ &\quad + (n-2)\rho S_{n-1}^{*-1} \bar{g}_{ij} - \rho S_{n-1}^{*-2} (S_{n-1}^*)'_{kl} \mathfrak{r}_{ij}^* \bar{g}_{kl} \\ &\quad - S_{n-1}^{*-1} \bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}_j \rho + S_{n-1}^{*-2} \bar{\nabla}_i \rho \bar{\nabla}_j S_{n-1}^* + S_{n-1}^{*-2} \bar{\nabla}_j \rho \bar{\nabla}_i S_{n-1}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the evolution equation of S_1^* satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t S_1^* &= \rho S_{n-1}^{*-2} (S_{n-1}^*)'_{kl} \bar{\nabla}_k \bar{\nabla}_l S_1^* - 2\rho S_{n-1}^{*-3} |\bar{\nabla} S_{n-1}^*|^2 \\ &\quad + \rho \bar{g}^{ij} S_{n-1}^{*-2} (S_{n-1}^*)''_{kl;mn} \bar{\nabla}_i \mathfrak{r}_{kl}^* \bar{\nabla}_j \mathfrak{r}_{mn}^* \\ &\quad + (n-2)(n-1)\rho S_{n-1}^{*-1} - \rho S_{n-1}^{*-2} S_1^* (S_{n-1}^*)'_{kl} \bar{g}_{kl} \\ &\quad - S_{n-1}^{*-1} \bar{\Delta} \rho + 2S_{n-1}^{*-2} \bar{\nabla} \rho \cdot \bar{\nabla} S_{n-1}^*. \end{aligned}$$

a: *Estimating the terms on the first line:* The first term on the first line is a good term viewed as an elliptic operator that is non-positive at the point and direction at which the maximum of S_1^* is achieved. The second term is a good non-positive term.

b: *Estimating the term on the second line:* Concavity of $S_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ gives

$$(4.1) \quad \left[(S_{n-1}^*)''_{kl;mn} - \frac{n-2}{(n-1)S_{n-1}^*} (S_{n-1}^*)'_{kl} (S_{n-1}^*)'_{mn} \right] \bar{\nabla}_i \mathfrak{r}_{kl}^* \bar{\nabla}_j \mathfrak{r}_{mn}^* \leq 0.$$

c: *Estimating the last term on the third line:* By Newton's inequality, we get

$$(4.2) \quad S_{n-1}^{*-2} S_1^* (S_{n-1}^*)'_{kl} \bar{g}_{kl} = S_{n-1}^{*-2} S_1^* S_{n-2}^* \geq C S_{n-1}^{*-2} S_1^* S_{n-1}^{*\frac{n-3}{n-2}} S_1^{*\frac{1}{n-2}}.$$

d: *Estimating the terms on the last line:* Since $p = -n$,

$$(4.3) \quad -S_{n-1}^{*-1} \bar{\Delta} \rho \leq C S_1^* + C,$$

where we used boundedness of $|\bar{\nabla} h^*|$, $c'_2 \leq h^* \leq c'_1$, and $c'_4 \leq \mathcal{K}^* \leq c'_3$. To estimate the other term on the last line, we use Young's inequality and that $p = -n$:

$$(4.4) \quad |\bar{\nabla} \rho \cdot \bar{\nabla} S_{n-1}^*| \leq \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon |\bar{\nabla} S_{n-1}^*|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} |\bar{\nabla} \rho|^2) \leq C(\varepsilon |\bar{\nabla} S_{n-1}^*|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1}).$$

Combining inequalities (4.1), (4.2), (4.3), and (4.4) with the lower and upper bounds on S_{n-1}^* , we obtain, for an $\varepsilon > 0$ that is small enough, that

$$\partial_t S_1^* \leq C' \left(1 + S_1^* - C S_1^{*\frac{n-1}{n-2}} \right).$$

This implies that $S_1^* \leq C(1 + t^{-(n-2)})$ for some $C > 0$ depending on c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, p . Therefore, in view of $\mathcal{K}^* \leq c'_3$, we get

$$\frac{1}{C(1 + t^{-(n-2)})} \leq \kappa_i^* \leq c'_3 \left(C + C t^{-(n-2)} \right)^{n-2}$$

on $(0, t_0]$. Finally Theorem 2.1 yields

$$\frac{1}{C(1 + t^{-(n-2)})^{n-2}} \leq \kappa_i \leq C(1 + t^{-(n-2)})$$

on $(0, t_0]$. Thus uniform lower and upper bounds for $\{\kappa_i\}$ on $[0, t_0]$ follow. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *Let $n \geq 3$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $p = -n$. Assume that $\{K_t\}$ is a solution of (1.2) with $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$. Then the lifespan of the solution is finite.*

Proof. Taking into account Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5, the proof is similar to the one for Lemma 4.3. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *Let $n \geq 3$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $p = -n$. Assume that $\{K_t\}$ is a solution of (1.2) with $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \max h_{K_t} = \infty$.*

Proof. Considering Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5, the proof is similar to the one for Proposition 4.4. $\square$

Proposition 4.8. *If $p = -n$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} V(K_t) = \infty$.*

Proof. Since hypersurfaces are expanding, for each t we can put a cone C_t inside K_t with height $\max h_{K_t}$ and a fixed origin-centered ball as the base. Lemma 4.7 shows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} V(C_t) = \infty$. The claim follows. $\square$

5. MONOTONICITY OF ENTROPIES ALONG THE FLOW

Lemma 5.1. *The following statements hold:*

- Let $-n \leq p < \infty$. If $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $e_p(K_0) = \vec{o}$, then $e_p(K_t) = \vec{o}$.
- Let $-n \leq p \leq -n + 1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$. If $e_p^\varphi(K_0) = \vec{o}$, then $e_p^\varphi(K_t) = \vec{o}$.

Proof. We justify the first claim:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{h_{K_t}^{1-p}(u)} d\sigma(u) = (p-1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{\mathcal{K}(u)} d\sigma(u) = 0.$$

Therefore, $e_p(K_t) = \vec{o}$ on $[0, T)$. $\square$

Lemma 5.2. *The following statements hold:*

- Let $-n \leq p < \infty$ and $\varphi \equiv 1$. If $e_p(K_0) = \vec{o}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} V(\Lambda_p K_t) &= \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{V(\Lambda_p K_t)}{V(K_t)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} d\sigma - \frac{(1-p)n^2}{n-1} \frac{V(K_t)V_1(K_t, \Lambda_p K_t)}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma} \\ &\quad - \frac{n^2 p}{n-1} \frac{V(K_t)V(\Lambda_p K_t)}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

- If $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$ and $e_p^\varphi(K_0) = \vec{o}$, or $-n \leq p < \infty$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$ and $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_e^n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K_t) &= \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K_t)}{V(K_t)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \varphi \frac{h_{K_t}^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} d\sigma - \frac{(1-p)n^2}{n-1} \frac{V(K_t)V_1(K_t, \Lambda_p^\varphi K_t)}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^p}{\varphi} d\sigma} \\ &\quad - \frac{n^2 p}{n-1} \frac{V(K_t)V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K_t)}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^p}{\varphi} d\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will prove the first claim. Taking Lemma 5.1 into account, computation is straightforward:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} V(\Lambda_p K_t) &= \frac{1}{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\Lambda_p K_t} \partial_t \left(\frac{V(K_t)}{\frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma} \frac{1}{h_{K_t}^{1-p}} \right) d\sigma \\ &= \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{V(\Lambda_p K_t)}{V(K_t)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} d\sigma - \frac{(1-p)n^2}{n-1} \frac{V(K_t)V_1(K_t, \Lambda_p K_t)}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma} \\ &\quad - \frac{n^2 p}{n-1} \frac{V(K_t)V(\Lambda_p K_t)}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that Remark 3.7 justifies that the taking time-derivative of the Gauss curvature of $\Lambda_p^\varphi K_t$ is legitimate. $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *We have for*

- $-n \leq p < \infty$ and $\varphi \equiv 1 : \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{A}_p(K_t) \geq 0$, and if $e_p(K_0) = \vec{o}$ and $p \neq 1$ then $\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p(K_t)}{1-p} \geq 0$.
- $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+ : \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(K_t) \geq 0$, and if $e_p^\varphi(K_0) = \vec{o}$ then $\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(K_t) \geq 0$.
- $-n \leq p < \infty, \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$ and $K_0 \in \mathcal{F}_e^n : \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(K_t) \geq 0$, and if $p \neq 1$ then $\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(K_t)}{1-p} \geq 0$.

Proof. We prove the claims for $\mathcal{B}_p$ and $\mathcal{A}_p$ and $p \neq 0$. Monotonicity of $\mathcal{A}_p(K_t)$ follows from the Hölder inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{A}_p(K_t) \\ &= \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} d\sigma \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^p d\sigma - n^2 V(K_t)^2 \right)}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^p d\sigma \right)^{\frac{n}{p}+1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{nV(K_t)}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^p d\sigma \right)^{\frac{n}{p}+1}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^{1-p}} d\sigma \right) \frac{d}{dt} e_p(K_t) \\ &= \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} d\sigma \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^p d\sigma - \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}}{\mathcal{K}} d\sigma \right)^2 \right)}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t-e_p(K_t)}^p d\sigma \right)^{\frac{n}{p}+1}} \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the inverse function theorem to justify that $\frac{d}{dt} e_p(K_t)$ exists.

Monotonicity of $\mathcal{B}_p(K_t)$ follows from Lemma 5.1 and inequality (3.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.1) \quad \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{B}_p(K_t) &= \frac{1}{V(\Lambda_p K_t)^n} \left[nV(K_t)^{n-1}V(\Lambda_p K_t) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} d\sigma \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}} \right. \\
 &\quad - n^2 V(K_t)^{n+1} V(\Lambda_p K_t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}-1} \\
 &\quad - nV(K_t)^{n-1}V(\Lambda_p K_t) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} d\sigma \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}} \\
 &\quad + (1-p)n^2 V(K_t)^{n+1} V_1(K_t, \Lambda_p K_t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}-1} \\
 &\quad \left. + n^2 p V(K_t)^{n+1} V(\Lambda_p K_t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}-1} \right] \\
 &= \frac{n^2(1-p)V(K_t)^{n+1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{n}{p}-1}}{V(\Lambda_p K_t)^{n-1}} \left(\frac{V_1(K_t, \Lambda_p K_t)}{V(\Lambda_p K_t)} - 1 \right) \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

6. BOUNDING EXTRINSIC DIAMETER

Lemma 6.1. *Fix $0 < a < \infty$. Suppose $V(K) = \omega_n$ and*

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma \leq a & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty) \\ \exp\left(\frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\log(h_K(u) - e_0 \cdot u) d\sigma\right) \geq a & \text{if } p = 0 \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - e_p(K) \cdot u)^p d\sigma \geq a & \text{if } p \in (-n, 0). \end{cases}$$

Then the extrinsic diameter of K , $d(K)$, is bounded above by a positive number independent of K . The same statement also holds for the following cases:

- when $-n < p \leq -n+1$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_K(u) - e_p^\varphi(K) \cdot u)^p d\sigma}{\varphi(u)} \geq a,$$

- when $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$, $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$ and

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_K^p}{\varphi} d\sigma \leq a & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty) \\ \exp\left(\frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\frac{\log h_K}{\varphi} d\sigma\right) \geq a & \text{if } p = 0 \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_K^p}{\varphi} d\sigma \geq a & \text{if } p \in (-n, 0). \end{cases}$$

Proof. We prove only the first set of claims. The proof of Guan and Ni [24, Corollary 2.5] extends to the interval $p \in (-1, \infty)$. For $-n < p < 0$, we argue as follows [17, p. 58]: Suppose, on the contrary, that there is a sequence of convex bodies $\{K_i\}$ satisfying the uniform lower bound, but $d(K_i) \rightarrow \infty$. Since the above inequalities are invariant under any translation, we may assume without loss of generality that K_i are centered at the origin. Let E_i denote John's ellipsoid of K_i . That is, $\frac{1}{n}E_i \subset K_i \subseteq E_i$. Therefore, $\frac{h_{E_i}}{n} < h_{K_i} \leq h_{E_i}$. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we decompose

$\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ into three sets as follows:

$$S_1 := \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \{h_{E_i} < \varepsilon\}, \quad S_2 := \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \{\varepsilon < h_{E_i} < \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\}, \quad \& \quad S_3 := \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \{h_{E_i} > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\}.$$

On the one hand,

$$a \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_i}(u) - e_p(K_i) \cdot u)^p d\sigma \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_i}^p d\sigma < \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \left(\frac{h_{E_i}}{n}\right)^p d\sigma.$$

On the other hand, as $d(K_i) \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_1} \left(\frac{h_{E_i}}{n}\right)^p d\sigma &\leq \left(\int_{S_1} \left(\frac{h_{E_i}}{n}\right)^{-n} d\sigma\right)^{\frac{-p}{n}} |S_1|^{\frac{p+n}{n}} \\ &\leq c_1 |S_1|^{\frac{p+n}{n}} \rightarrow 0, \\ |S_2| &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\int_{S_3} \left(\frac{h_{E_i}}{n}\right)^p d\sigma \leq \int_{S_3} \left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon}\right)^p d\sigma = \left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon}\right)^p |S_3| \leq c_3 \varepsilon^{-p}.$$

Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we get

$$a \leq o(1) + c_3 \varepsilon^{-p}.$$

Sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we reach a contradiction. $\square$

7. CONTINUITY OF ENTROPY MAP AND ENTROPY FUNCTIONAL

Theorem 7.1 (Continuity of entropy map). *The following maps are continuous.*

- $e_p : (\mathcal{K}^n, d_{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for $-n \leq p < \infty$,
- $e_p^\varphi : (\mathcal{K}^n, d_{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$.

Here $d_{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes the Hausdorff distance.

Proof. We address the case $p \in [-n, 1)$, $p \neq 0$ and the statement for e_p . Suppose $p \in (0, 1)$. Let $\{K_i\}$ be a family of convex bodies that converges to K_∞ as i approaches ∞ . Suppose that for a subsequence i_j that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} e_p(K_{i_j}) = q \neq e_p(K_\infty)$, where $q \in K_\infty$. Note that $e_p(K_\infty) \in \text{int } K_\infty$ implies $e_p(K_\infty) \in \text{int } K_i$ if i large is enough. Thus, for any j that is large enough, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_{i_j}}(u) - e_p(K_{i_j}) \cdot u)^p d\sigma > \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_{i_j}}(u) - e_p(K_\infty) \cdot u)^p d\sigma.$$

Taking the limit from both sides, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_\infty}(u) - q \cdot u)^p d\sigma \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_\infty}(u) - e_p(K_\infty) \cdot u)^p d\sigma.$$

This contradicts that $e_p(K_\infty)$ is the unique maximizer of $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_\infty}(u) - x \cdot u)^p d\sigma$ on K_∞ . Now we consider the case $-n \leq p < 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_{i_j}}(u) - e_p(K_{i_j}) \cdot u)^p d\sigma \\ &\leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_{i_j}}(u) - e_p(K_\infty) \cdot u)^p d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_\infty}(u) - e_p(K_\infty) \cdot u)^p d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using Fatou's lemma we get

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_{i_j}}(u) - e_p(K_{i_j}) \cdot u)^p d\sigma \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_\infty}(u) - q \cdot u)^p d\sigma.$$

Thus, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_\infty}(u) - e_p(K_\infty) \cdot u)^p d\sigma \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_{K_\infty}(u) - q \cdot u)^p d\sigma.$$

This is a contradiction. $\square$

Remark 7.2. For $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $p = -n$, Theorem 7.1 was proved by Petty [41, Lemma 2.2].

Theorem 7.3 (Continuity of $\mathcal{A}_p$). *The following functionals are continuous.*

- $\mathcal{A}_p : (\mathcal{K}^n, d_{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for $-n \leq p < \infty$,
- $\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi : (\mathcal{K}^n, d_{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$,
- $\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi : (\mathcal{K}_e^n, d_{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for $-n \leq p < \infty$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$.

Proof. The first two claims follows from the continuity of $e_p(\cdot)$, $e_p^\varphi(\cdot)$, Theorem 7.1, and that e_p , e_p^φ are interior points. The last claim is trivial in view of our agreement that $e_p^\varphi(K) = \vec{o}$ whenever $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$. $\square$

Theorem 7.4. *Fix p and $0 < a < \infty$. Define the entropy class $S_{p,a}$ to be the set of all convex bodies K such that $V(K) = \omega_n$ and*

$$\begin{cases} e_p(K) = \vec{o}, \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K^p d\sigma \leq a & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty) \\ e_p(K) = \vec{o}, \exp\left(\frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\log h_K d\sigma\right) \geq a & \text{if } p = 0 \\ e_p(K) = \vec{o}, \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K^p d\sigma \geq a > 0 & \text{if } p \in (-n, 0). \end{cases}$$

Then there exist $0 < r, R < \infty$ depending only on n, p, a such that for any $K \in S_{p,a}$ we have $r \leq h_K \leq R$. Additionally, similar conclusions hold for the following sets:

- *when $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$ and $-n < p \leq -n+1$, define the entropy class $S_{\varphi,p,a}$ to be the set of all convex bodies K such that $V(K) = \omega_n$ and*

$$e_p^\varphi(K) = \vec{o}, \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_K^p}{\varphi} d\sigma \geq a,$$

- *when $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$, define $S_{e,\varphi,p,a}$ to be the set of all origin-symmetric convex bodies K such that $V(K) = \omega_n$ and*

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_K^p}{\varphi} d\sigma \leq a & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty) \\ \exp\left(\frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} -\frac{\log h_K}{\varphi} d\sigma\right) \geq a & \text{if } p = 0 \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_K^p}{\varphi} d\sigma \geq a & \text{if } p \in (-n, 0). \end{cases}$$

Proof. The last set of claims follows easily: $S_{e,\varphi,p,a} \subset \mathcal{K}_e^n$ and $\{d(K)\}_{K \in S_{e,\varphi,p,a}}$ is uniformly bounded by Lemma 6.1. Therefore, since volume is fixed, in-radii of convex bodies in $S_{e,\varphi,p,a}$ are uniformly bounded below. Moreover, for $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$, the ball with maximal radius enclosed by K must be centered at the origin. Next we prove the remaining claims. Since volume is normalized and $\{d(K)\}_{K \in S_{\varphi,p,a}}$ is uniformly bounded by Lemma 6.1, it is enough to prove that there exists $r > 0$ such that $h_K > r$ for any $K \in S_{\varphi,p,a}$. Suppose, on the contrary, that there is a sequence of convex bodies $\{K_i\} \subset S_{\varphi,p,a}$ such that $\text{dist}(\vec{o}, \partial K_i) \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 6.1, $\{d(K_i)\}$ is uniformly bounded above. Thus, by Blaschke's selection theorem, $\{K_i\}$

converges (passing to a further subsequence if necessary) to K_∞ in the Hausdorff distance and, additionally, $\vec{o} \in \partial K_\infty$. On the other hand, by Theorems 7.1 and 7.3, $K_\infty \in S_{\varphi,p,a}$. This is a contradiction. $\square$

Corollary 7.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorems 1.2, A1 with $p \neq -2$, A2, and A3, there exist r, R such that $0 < r \leq h_{\tilde{K}_t} \leq R < \infty$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, entropy points remain at the origin. By Lemma 5.3, K_t for $t > 0$ belongs to the same entropy class as K_0 . Therefore, the claim follows from Theorem 7.4. $\square$

Theorem 7.6. *The following statements are true:*

- Let $-n \leq p < \infty$, and assume $\{K_i\} \subset \mathcal{K}_0^n$ with $e_p(K_i) = \vec{o}$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to K_∞ . Then $\{\Lambda_p K_i\}$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to $\Lambda_p K_\infty$.
- Let $-n \leq p < \infty$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_e^+$, and assume that $\{K_i\} \subset \mathcal{K}_e^n$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to K_∞ . Then $\{\Lambda_p^\varphi K_i\}$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to $\Lambda_p^\varphi K_\infty$.
- Let $-n \leq p \leq -n+1$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$, and assume $\{K_i\} \subset \mathcal{K}_0^n$ with $e_p^\varphi(K_i) = \vec{o}$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to K_∞ . Then $\{\Lambda_p^\varphi K_i\}$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to $\Lambda_p^\varphi K_\infty$.

Proof. We give the proof of the first statement. By Theorem 7.1, $\vec{o} = e_p(K_i) \rightarrow e_p(K_\infty)$. Since $e_p(K_\infty) = \vec{o}$ is an interior point of K_∞ , we have $r \leq h_{K_i} \leq R$ for some $0 < r, R < \infty$ independent of i . On the other hand, in view of (3.1), $\text{cent}(\Lambda_p K_i) = \text{cent}(K_i)$, and [16, Lemma 3, Lemma 4], we conclude that there exist $0 < r', R' < \infty$ independent of i , such that $\Lambda_p K_i \subset B_{R'}$ and $V(\Lambda_p K_i) \geq \omega_n r'^n$ (note that in both Lemmas 3, 4 of [16] the assumption that K is of class C^4 is unnecessary; therefore, here we do not need to know the regularity of $\Lambda_p K_i$). Take a convergent subsequence of $\{\Lambda_p K_i\}$ and denote it again by $\{\Lambda_p K_i\}$. The limiting figure must be a convex body, say $\tilde{K}$. Choose an arbitrary convex body P . From the weak continuity of surface area measures we get

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_P dS_{\Lambda_p K_i} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_P dS_{\tilde{K}} = V_1(\tilde{K}, P).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_P dS_{\Lambda_p K_i} &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{V(K_i)}{\frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_i}^p d\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_P h_{K_i}^{p-1} d\sigma \right) \\ &= \frac{V(K_\infty)}{\frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_\infty}^p d\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_P h_{K_\infty}^{p-1} d\sigma \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_P dS_{\Lambda_p K_\infty} = V_1(\Lambda_p K_\infty, P). \end{aligned}$$

Since $V_1(\Lambda_p K_\infty, P) = V_1(\tilde{K}, P)$ holds for any convex body P , we conclude that $\Lambda_p K_\infty$ is a translation of $\tilde{K}$; see [46, Theorem 8.1.2]. Furthermore, note that $\text{cent}(K_i) = \text{cent}(\Lambda_p K_i)$, thus $\text{cent}(\Lambda_p K_\infty) = \text{cent}(K_\infty) = \text{cent}(\tilde{K})$. That is, no translation is needed; $\Lambda_p K_\infty = \tilde{K}$. Finally, notice that the limit is independent of the convergent subsequence. The proof is complete. $\square$

Lemma 7.7. *Under the assumptions of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, A1, A2, and A3 we have*

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \frac{1}{p} \log \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^p}{\varphi} d\sigma = \infty & \text{if } p \neq 0 \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{\log h_{K_t}}{\varphi} d\sigma = \infty & \text{if } p = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We prove the claim for $p \neq 0$ and $\varphi \equiv 1$. First, we consider $p \neq -n$. Corollary 7.5 shows that $0 < r \leq h_{\tilde{K}_t} \leq R < \infty$. Thus $\frac{\min h_{K_t}}{\max h_{K_t}} \geq \frac{r}{R} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{p} \log \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_t}^p d\sigma \geq \frac{1}{p} \log \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (\max h_{K_t})^p d\sigma + c$. Since $\max h_{K_t} \rightarrow \infty$ by Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 4.7, the claim follows. Now we consider case $p = -n$. Since $V(K) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{h_K^n} d\sigma$ is $GL(n)$ invariant and $\mathcal{A}_{-n}(K_t)$ is monotone along the flow, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow T} n \mathcal{A}_{-n}(K_t) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow T} V(K_t) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{h_{K_t}^n} d\sigma = \lim_{t \rightarrow T} V(l_t K_t) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{h_{l_t K_t}^n} d\sigma \\ &\leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow T} V(l_t K_t) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{h_{l_t K_t - p_t}^n} d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

where $l_t \in GL(n)$ and $p_t \in \text{int } l_t K_t$. Note that to get this last inequality we used the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{h_{l_t K_t - p_t}^n} d\sigma$ is minimized on $l_t K_t$ only when p_t is $e_{-n}(l_t K_t) = l_t e_{-n}(K_t) = \vec{o}$ (see Petty [41, Lemma 2.2] for a proof that the Santaló point mapping, e_{-n} , is affinely equivariant and continuous). Moreover, we can choose l_t , p_t such that $V(l_t K_t) = \omega_n$ and $0 < r < h_{l_t K_t - p_t} < R < \infty$ for some universal constants r, R . This ensures that the limit of $n \mathcal{A}_{-n}(K_t)$ along the flow is finite. That is, for some $c < \infty$ we have

$$V(K_t) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{h_{K_t}^n} d\sigma < c.$$

Now recall Proposition 4.8 that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} V(K_t) = \infty$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{h_{K_t}^n} d\sigma = 0.$$

□

Lemma 7.8. *Under the assumptions of Theorems 1.1, A1, A2, and A3 we have for a subsequence of $\{K_t\}$ that*

$$\lim_{t_i \rightarrow T} \frac{V_1(K_{t_i}, \Lambda_p^\varphi K_{t_i})}{V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K_{t_i})} = 1, \quad \lim_{t_i \rightarrow T} \frac{V_1(K_{t_i}, \Lambda_p K_{t_i})}{V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K_{t_i})} = 1.$$

Proof. We prove the claim for $p \neq 0$. Suppose, on the contrary, that there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 > 0$, such that for any $t > t_0$ we have $\frac{V_1(K_t, \Lambda_p^\varphi K_t)}{V(\Lambda_p^\varphi K_t)} - 1 \geq \varepsilon$. From (5.1) it follows that

$$(7.1) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(K_t)}{1-p} \geq n\varepsilon \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{p} \log \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^p}{\varphi} d\sigma \right).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 7.7, $\frac{1}{p} \log \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{h_{K_t}^p}{\varphi} d\sigma$ can be made arbitrarily large if t is close enough to T . By integrating both sides of (7.1) on $[t_0, s]$ and then

sending $s \rightarrow T$ we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(K_t)}{1-p} = \infty.$$

This is a contradiction in view of Theorem 7.6: First, note that $\mathcal{B}_p^\varphi$ is scaling-invariant. Second, when $p \neq -n$, Corollary 7.5 shows that $0 < r \leq h_{\tilde{K}_t} \leq R < \infty$. Therefore, by Blaschke's selection theorem, there is a subsequence, $\{\tilde{K}_{t_i}\}$, that converges in the Hausdorff distance to a limiting shape, say $\tilde{K}_\infty$. Taking Theorem 7.6 into consideration, we conclude that $\{\Lambda_p^\varphi \tilde{K}_{t_i}\}$ converges to $\Lambda_p^\varphi \tilde{K}_\infty$. Consequently,

$$\infty \leftarrow \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(K_{t_i})}{1-p} = \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_{t_i})}{1-p} \rightarrow \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_\infty)}{1-p}.$$

Since $0 < r \leq h_{\tilde{K}_\infty} \leq R < \infty$, we must have $0 < \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_\infty) < \infty$. When $p = -n$, note that $\frac{\log \mathcal{B}_p(K_t)}{1-p}$ is $GL(n)$ -invariant. Therefore, we may assume that $\{d(l_t \tilde{K}_t)\}$ is uniformly bounded for suitable choices of $l_t \in SL(n)$. We may now continue the previous argument for $p \neq -n$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ to reach a contradiction. $\square$

8. PROOFS OF THEOREMS A1, A2, A3 WITH CONVERGENCE IN THE C^1 -TOPOLOGY AND PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.1, 1.3

Proofs given in this section rely heavily on entropy functionals B_p^φ . In this section we will not give the proof of Theorem 1.2, since Lemma 7.8, in view of $\frac{d}{dt} B_1^\varphi \equiv 0$, is not useful when $p = 1$. See Section 9 for the proof.

Fact 8.1. *Let φ be a positive function on the unit sphere of class $C^{k,\alpha}$, where k is a non-negative integer and $0 < \alpha < 1$. Assume $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ has a positive continuous curvature function such that $f_K h_K^{1-p} = \varphi$. Then K is of class $C_+^{k+2,\alpha}$.*

Proof. Since $h_K > 0$, the Gauss curvature of K in the generalized sense (in the sense of Alexandrov), and thus in the viscosity sense is pinched between two positive numbers. Hence, by Caffarelli [14, Corollary 3] K is strictly convex (when $n = 3$ this conclusion follows from Alexandrov's theorem 1942 [1]). This in turn implies that h_K is C^1 (cf. [46, Corollary 1.7.3]), and so the right-hand side of $f_K = h_K^{p-1} \varphi$ is positive and C^α . Thus, K is of class $C_+^{2,\alpha}$; it follows from Caffarelli's work [15, Theorem 4] that, for given nonnegative integer k and $0 < \alpha < 1$, the solution of Minkowski's problem is of class $C^{k+2,\alpha}$ if the given Gauss curvature on the spherical image is of class $C^{k,\alpha}$ (see also Jerison [32, Theorem 0.7]). So h_K is C^2 . Higher order regularity up to $C_+^{k+2,\alpha}$ follows by induction using [15, Theorem 4]. $\square$

8.1. Proofs of Theorems A1, A2, A3 with convergence in the C^1 -topology.

We prove the statements for $p \neq 0, -2$. We will consider the case $p = -2$ in section 8.2. Consider the sequence introduced in Lemma 7.8. Corollary 7.5 shows that a subsequence of $\{\tilde{K}_{t_i}\}$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to a limiting shape $\tilde{K}_\infty$ with the origin in its interior. By Theorem 7.6 and Lemma 7.8 we conclude that

$$V_1(\tilde{K}_\infty, \Lambda_p^\varphi \tilde{K}_\infty) = V(\Lambda_p^\varphi \tilde{K}_\infty) \Rightarrow \tilde{K}_\infty = \Lambda_p^\varphi \tilde{K}_\infty.$$

In particular, we conclude that $\lim_{t_i \rightarrow T} \frac{V(\Lambda_p^\varphi \tilde{K}_{t_i})}{V(\tilde{K}_{t_i})} = 1$. Therefore, $0 < \lim_{t_i \rightarrow T} \mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_{t_i}) = \lim_{t_i \rightarrow T} \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_{t_i}) < \infty$. So monotonicity of $\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_t)$ and $\mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_t)$ yield $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_t) =$

$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_t)$. This, in turn, has two implications:

$$(8.1) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \left(\frac{V(\Lambda_p^\varphi \tilde{K}_t)}{V(\tilde{K}_t)} \right)^{n-1} = \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \frac{\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_t)}{\mathcal{B}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_t)} = 1,$$

$$(8.2) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_{\tilde{K}_t}(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p}{\varphi(u)} d\sigma = \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi(\tilde{K}_t)}{V(\tilde{K}_t)} \right)^{-\frac{p}{n}} = \frac{\omega_n}{c} > 0.$$

Corollary 7.5 and equalities (8.1) and (8.2) imply that every given subsequence of $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$ has a convergent subsequence such that its limit satisfies

$$V(L) = V(\Lambda_p^\varphi L) \Rightarrow L = \Lambda_p^\varphi L,$$

and thus L is a solution of

$$\varphi h_L^{1-p} dS_L = \frac{\omega_n}{\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(h_{\tilde{K}_t}(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p}{\varphi(u)} d\sigma} d\sigma = cd\sigma.$$

Fact 8.1 implies that $L \in \mathcal{F}_0^n$. The C^1 -convergence, which is purely geometric and does not depend on the evolution equation, follows from [4, Lemma 13]. Finally, when $p \geq 1$ and $p \neq n$, in view of the uniqueness theorem of Lutwak [38, Corollary 2.3, $i=0$], there is only one solution to $\varphi h_L^{1-p} dS_L = cd\sigma$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with volume ω_n . In particular, if $\varphi \equiv 1$, then L must be the unit ball. When $p = n$ the uniqueness follows from [17, Theorem B]; therefore, if $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $V(L) = \omega_n$, then L must be the unit ball. In $\mathbb{R}^2$ a classification result of Andrews [7] states that for $-2 < p < 1$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ the only solution with area π is the unit disk.

8.2. Proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.3. A convex body K has its centroid at the origin if and only if K^* has its Santaló point at the origin [46, p. 546]. Thus, in view of Lemma 2.3, there is a one-one correspondence between solutions of (1.2) for $p = -n$ and solutions of (1.5). In view of John's ellipsoid lemma, there exist $l_{t_i} \in SL(n)$, such that $d(l_{t_i} \tilde{K}_{t_i}) \leq 2n$. Since $e_{-n}(l_{t_i} \tilde{K}_{t_i}) = \vec{o}$, by the Blaschke selection theorem and by Theorem 7.1 we can show that, after passing to a subsequence, $l_{t_i} \tilde{K}_{t_i} \rightarrow \tilde{K}_\infty \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. Moreover, arguing as in Section 8.1, $\tilde{K}_\infty$ is a weak solution of $h_K^{1+n} dS_K = cd\sigma$. It was proved by Philippis and Marini [39], and Schneider [46, Theorem 10.5.1] that the origin-centered ellipsoids are the only solutions of $h_K^{1+n} dS_K = cd\sigma$ (this also follows from Fact 8.1 and the classical theorem of Pogorelov [26, Theorem 4.3.1])². Therefore, by Theorem 7.3, we get $\mathcal{A}_{-n}(K_{t_i}) = \mathcal{A}_{-n}(l_{t_i} K_{t_i}) = \mathcal{A}_{-n}(l_{t_i} \tilde{K}_{t_i}) \rightarrow n\omega_n^2$. Monotonicity of $\mathcal{A}_{-n}(K_t)$ then implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathcal{A}_{-n}(\tilde{K}_t) = n\omega_n^2$. Consequently, for any arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose a t_ε large enough that $V(K_t)V(K_t^*) = \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{A}_{-n}(K_t) \geq \omega_n^2/(1+\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in [t_\varepsilon, T)$. Choosing a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ ensures that the argument of [30, Section 6] or [31] can be employed to prove the existence of a sequence of times $\{t_k\}$ approaching T and a sequence of special linear transformations l_{t_k} such that $\{l_{t_k} \tilde{K}_{t_k}\}$ converges in C^∞ to the unit ball. The stronger convergence statements in the theorems follow from [36, Proposition 9.2.4] by considering the linearization of the evolution equations about the space of origin-symmetric ellipsoids.

²In [42, Lemma 8.1, Lemma 8.7], Petty proves that the origin-centered ellipsoids are the only solutions of $h_K^{1+n} dS_K = cd\sigma$, provided either $n = 2$, or $n \geq 3$ and K is rotationally symmetric.

9. CONVERGENCE IN THE C^∞ -TOPOLOGY IN THEOREMS 1.2, A1, A2, A3

In this section we prove the C^∞ convergence in Theorems 1.2, A1, A2, and A3. Since we discussed the case $p = -2$ in Section 8.2, here we mainly focus on $p > -2$. To prove the C^∞ convergence, we will only need to obtain a uniform upper bound for the Gauss curvature of the normalized solution. In fact, in Corollary 7.5 we have established the first order regularity estimate $r \leq h_{\tilde{K}_t} \leq R$. Moreover, the lower bound on the Gauss curvature given in Lemma 4.1, $\mathcal{K} \geq 1/(a + bt^{-\frac{n-1}{n}})$, is independent of the initial data on $[t_0/2, t_0]$; it is quite standard that such a bound yields a uniform lower bound on the Gauss curvature of the normalized solution. Once we are equipped with uniform C^k estimates for $\{\tilde{K}_t\}$, we can use the monotonicity of functionals $\mathcal{A}_p^\varphi$ to prove that there exists a sequence of times $\{t_k\}$ approaching T for which $\{\tilde{K}_{t_k}\}$ converges in C^∞ to a solution of (1.3). The stronger convergence statement in Theorem 1.2 follows from the uniqueness of the self-similar solution in the class of origin-symmetric convex bodies.

Lemma 9.1. *The following evolution equations hold along the flow (1.2):*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t |F|^{1+n-p} &= (F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \varphi \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \nabla_i \nabla_j |F|^{1+n-p} \\ &\quad + \varphi n(1+n-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-p}}{\mathcal{K}} |F|^{-1+n-p} \\ &\quad - \varphi(1+n-p)(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} |F|^{-1+n-p} g_{ij} \\ &\quad - \varphi(-1+n-p)(1+n-p)(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} |F|^{-3+n-p} \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} (F_i \cdot F)(F_j \cdot F), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) &= (F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \varphi \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \nabla_i \nabla_j \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \\ &\quad + (F \cdot \nu)^{4-2p} \varphi^2 \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}_j^i}{\mathcal{K}^3} w_i^k w_k^j \\ &\quad + \varphi^2 (2-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-2p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \\ &\quad - \varphi(2-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{1-p}}{\mathcal{K}} F \cdot DF \left(\nabla \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} d\varphi \left(DF \left(\nabla \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} &- (F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \varphi \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \nabla_i \nabla_j |F|^{1+n-p} = \\ &+ \varphi(n-1)(1+n-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-p}}{\mathcal{K}} |F|^{-1+n-p} \\ &- \varphi(1+n-p)(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} |F|^{-1+n-p} \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} g_{ij} \\ &- \varphi(-1+n-p)(1+n-p)(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} |F|^{-3+n-p} \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} (F_i \cdot F)(F_j \cdot F). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\partial_t |F|^{1+n-p} = \varphi(1+n-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-p}}{\mathcal{K}} |F|^{-1+n-p}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t |F|^{1+n-p} &= (F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \varphi \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \nabla_i \nabla_j |F|^{1+n-p} \\ &\quad + \varphi n(1+n-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-p}}{\mathcal{K}} |F|^{-1+n-p} \\ &\quad - \varphi(1+n-p) (F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} |F|^{-1+n-p} g_{ij} \\ &\quad - \varphi(-1+n-p)(1+n-p) (F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} |F|^{-3+n-p} \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} (F_i \cdot F)(F_j \cdot F). \end{aligned}$$

To calculate the evolution equation of $\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}$, we will employ the following two evolution equations (which can be obtained with straightforward computations; for example, see Andrews [2, Theorem 3.7]):

$$\partial_t w_i^j = -\nabla_i \nabla^j \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) - \varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} w_i^k w_k^j,$$

$$\partial_t \nu = -DF \left(\nabla \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) &= (F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \varphi \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \nabla_i \nabla_j \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \\ &\quad + (F \cdot \nu)^{4-2p} \varphi^2 \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}_j^i}{\mathcal{K}^3} w_i^k w_k^j \\ &\quad + \varphi^2 (2-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-2p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \\ &\quad - \varphi(2-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{1-p}}{\mathcal{K}} F \cdot DF \left(\nabla \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} d\varphi \left(DF \left(\nabla \left(\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 9.2. *Assume that $n = 2$ and $-\infty < p < \infty$ or $n \geq 3$ and $p \leq n$. Suppose there exists $0 < \gamma < 1$ such that solution $\{K_t\}$ to (1.2) satisfies $\gamma|F| \leq F \cdot \nu$ on $[0, t_0]$. Then there exists $\lambda > 0$ (independent of t_0) such that $\chi(\cdot, t) := |F|^{1+n-p}(\cdot, t) - \lambda \varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot, t)$ is always negative on $[0, t_0]$.*

Proof. Take λ such that χ is negative at time $t = 0$. We will prove that χ remains negative, perhaps for a larger value of λ . We calculate the evolution equation of χ and apply the maximum principle to χ on $[0, \tau]$, where $\tau > 0$ is the first time that for some $y \in \partial K_\tau$ we have $\chi(y, \tau) = 0$. Notice that at such a point, where the

maximum of χ is achieved, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\chi = 0 &\Rightarrow DF\left(\nabla\left(\lambda\varphi\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}\right)\right) = DF(\nabla|F|^{1+n-p}) \\ &= (1+n-p)|F|^{-1+n-p}F^\top,\end{aligned}$$

where $F^\top(\cdot, t)$ is the tangential component of $F(\cdot, t)$ to ∂K_t . Furthermore,

$$(F\cdot\nu)^{2-p}\frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2}\nabla_i\nabla_j\chi \leq 0,$$

and in view of the assumption $\gamma|F| \leq F\cdot\nu \leq |F|$ we get

$$(9.1) \quad \gamma^{|2-p|}\left(\frac{\lambda\varphi}{\mathcal{K}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \leq |F| \leq \gamma^{-|2-p|}\left(\frac{\lambda\varphi}{\mathcal{K}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}.$$

Also, using $(F_i\cdot F)(F_j\cdot F) \leq g_{ij}|F|^2$ and $p \leq n$, we may calculate

$$\begin{aligned}& -\varphi(1+n-p)(F\cdot\nu)^{2-p}|F|^{-1+n-p}\frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2}g_{ij} \\ & -\varphi(-1+n-p)(1+n-p)(F\cdot\nu)^{2-p}|F|^{-3+n-p}\frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2}(F_i\cdot F)(F_j\cdot F) \\ & \leq -\varphi(n-p)(1+n-p)(F\cdot\nu)^{2-p}|F|^{-3+n-p}\frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2}(F_i\cdot F)(F_j\cdot F) \leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from Lemma 9.1 it follows that at (y, τ) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\chi &\leq \varphi n(1+n-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{3-p}}{\mathcal{K}}|F|^{-1+n-p} \\ & -\lambda(F\cdot\nu)^{4-2p}\varphi^2\frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}_j^i}{\mathcal{K}^3}w_i^kw_k^j - \lambda\varphi^2(2-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{3-2p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \\ & + \varphi(2-p)(1+n-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{1-p}}{\mathcal{K}}|F|^{-1+n-p}|F^\top|^2 \\ & + (1+n-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}|F|^{n-p}|\bar{\nabla}\varphi| \\ & \leq \varphi n(1+n-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{3-p}}{\mathcal{K}}|F|^{-1+n-p} \\ & -\lambda\varphi^2(n-1)(F\cdot\nu)^{4-2p}\mathcal{K}^{\frac{n}{n-1}-3} - \lambda\varphi^2(2-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{3-2p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \\ & + \varphi(2-p)(1+n-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{1-p}}{\mathcal{K}}|F|^{-1+n-p}|F^\top|^2 \\ & + (1+n-p)\frac{(F\cdot\nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}|F|^{n-p}|\bar{\nabla}\varphi|.\end{aligned}$$

Here to obtain the second inequality we used the inverse-concavity of $\mathcal{K}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$: $\dot{\mathcal{K}}_j^iw_i^kw_k^j \geq (n-1)\mathcal{K}^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$. Now using inequalities $\gamma|F| \leq F\cdot\nu \leq |F|$ and (9.1), we obtain

$$0 \leq \partial_t\chi \leq \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1+n-2p}{n-1}}}{\mathcal{K}^{\frac{2n-2p+1}{n-1}}}\left(c + b\lambda^{\frac{1}{n-1}} - a\lambda^{\frac{2}{n-1}}\right)$$

for some $a, b, c > 0$ depending on p, γ, φ .³ Therefore, taking λ large enough proves the claim.

Next we consider the case $n = 2$. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\varphi(-1+n-p)(1+n-p)(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}|F|^{-3+n-p} \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}^{ij}}{\mathcal{K}^2} (F_i \cdot F)(F_j \cdot F) \\ & \leq |\varphi(1-p)(3-p)|(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} \frac{|F|^{1-p}}{\mathcal{K}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \partial_t \chi & \leq 2(3-p)\varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-p}}{\mathcal{K}} |F|^{1-p} \\ & - \varphi(3-p)(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} |F|^{1-p} \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}^2} \\ & + |\varphi(1-p)(3-p)|(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p} |F|^{1-p} \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}^2} \\ & - \lambda \varphi^2 \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{4-2p}}{\mathcal{K}} - \lambda \varphi^2 (2-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{3-2p}}{\mathcal{K}^2} \\ & + \varphi(2-p)(3-p) \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{1-p}}{\mathcal{K}} |F|^{1-p} |F^\top|^2 \\ & + |3-p| \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}} |F|^{2-p} |\bar{\nabla} \varphi| \\ & \leq \frac{\lambda^{3-2p}}{\mathcal{K}^{5-2p}} (c + b\lambda - a\lambda^2) \end{aligned}$$

for some $a, b, c > 0$ depending on γ, φ . Thus, taking λ large enough proves the claim. $\square$

The next corollary and our discussion in the beginning of this section complete our argument for deducing the C^∞ convergence in Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 9.3. *Suppose $p > -2$. Under the assumptions of Theorems 1.2, A1, A2, and A3, Gauss curvature of the normalized solution is uniformly bounded above. That is,*

$$\left(\frac{V(K_t)}{V(B)} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \mathcal{K}(\cdot, t) \leq C < \infty$$

for some C depending only on K_0, p, φ .

Proof. Corollary 7.5 guarantees that the assumption of Lemma 9.2 is satisfied. Since the degrees of homogeneity of $|F|^{1+n-p}$ and $\lambda \varphi \frac{(F \cdot \nu)^{2-p}}{\mathcal{K}}$ are equal, we conclude the upper bound for the normalized Gauss curvature. $\square$

10. APPLICATIONS

Theorem 10.1 (Lutwak [37]). *For any convex body K we have*

$$V(K)V((K - e_{-n})^*) \leq \left(\frac{V(\Lambda_{-n}K)}{V(K)} \right)^{n-1} \omega_n^2 \leq \omega_n^2.$$

³The λ -term with the highest exponent stems from $-\lambda(F \cdot \nu)^{4-2p} \varphi^2 \frac{\dot{\mathcal{K}}_j^i}{\mathcal{K}^3} w_i^k w_k^j$ or equivalently $-\lambda \varphi^2 (n-1)(F \cdot \nu)^{4-2p} \mathcal{K}^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}-3}$.

Proof. We may first prove the claim for C_+^∞ convex bodies. The general case follows from the first part of Theorem 7.6 and a standard approximation argument [46, Section 3.4]. Since the inequality is translation invariant, we may assume $e_{-n}(K) = \vec{o}$. We employ (1.2) with $p = -n$ and initial data $K_0 := K$. Now the claim follows from Lemma 5.1, the monotonicity of $\mathcal{B}_{-n}(K_t)$ established in Lemma 5.3, and Theorem 1.1. $\square$

Theorem 10.2. *For any convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ we have*

$$\begin{cases} V(K) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{2}{p}} \geq \pi (2\pi)^{\frac{-2}{p}} \frac{V(\Lambda_p K)}{V(K)} & \text{if } p > 1 \\ V(K) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{2}{p}} \leq \pi (2\pi)^{\frac{-2}{p}} \frac{V(\Lambda_p K)}{V(K)} & \text{if } -2 < p < 1 \text{ \& } p \neq 0 \\ V(K) \exp \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} -\log(h_K(u) - e_0 \cdot u) d\sigma}{\pi} \right) \leq \pi \frac{V(\Lambda_0 K)}{V(K)} & \text{if } p = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The claims follow from Lemmas 5.1, 5.3 and from Theorem A1. $\square$

As we have already mentioned, for $p > 1$, $\Lambda_p K = K$ implies that K is a ball (cf. Section 8.1). In the remaining of this section, we give a stability version of this fact in $\mathbb{R}^2$: if $\frac{V(K)}{V(\Lambda_p K)}$ is close to one, then K is close to a disk in the Hausdorff distance. To this end, we first recall Urysohn's inequality. Let us denote the mean width of $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ by $w(K) = \frac{2}{n\omega_n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K d\sigma$. Urysohn's inequality states that

$$\frac{V(K)}{\left(\frac{w(K)}{2}\right)^n} \leq \omega_n,$$

and equality holds exclusively for balls. The next lemma gives a lower bound for this ratio.

Lemma 10.3. *Assume that $p > 1$. For $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ we have*

$$\pi \frac{V(\Lambda_p K)}{V(K)} \leq \frac{V(K)}{\left(\frac{w(K)}{2}\right)^2}.$$

Proof. Theorem 10.2 gives

$$\pi (2\pi)^{-\frac{2}{p}} \frac{V(\Lambda_p K)}{V(K)} \leq V(K) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} (h_K(u) - e_p \cdot u)^p d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Applying the Hölder inequality to the right-hand side completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 10.4. *Assume that $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ and $p > 1$. There exist $\gamma, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ with the following property. If $\frac{V(K)}{V(\Lambda_p K)} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, then there exist $x \in \text{int } K$ and an origin-centered disk $\bar{B}$ such that*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}} \left(\left(\frac{\pi}{V(K)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (K - x), \bar{B} \right) \leq \gamma \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Proof. We may assume $V(K) = \pi$. From Lemma 10.3 we get $w \leq 2(1 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. On the other hand, by [46, Inequality 7.31, p. 385]

$$\left(\frac{w}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \geq \left(\frac{w}{2} - \frac{1}{\rho_+}\right)^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho_+}\right)^2.$$

Consequently,

$$\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\rho_+} \Rightarrow \rho_+ \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Suppose the Hausdorff distance of K and a ball $\bar{B}$, $K \subset \bar{B}$, of radius $\frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}}$ and center $x \in \text{int } K$ is d . Then, the volume of the hyperspherical cap of height d inside $\bar{B}$ is given by

$$V_{\text{cap}} = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^n}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \int_0^{\arccos(1 - d(1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}))} \sin^n(t) dt.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sin^n(t) dt = V(K) \\ & \leq V(\bar{B}) - V_{\text{cap}} \\ & = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^n}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \left(\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sin^n(t) dt - \gamma'_n \left(\arccos \left(1 - d(1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}) \right) \right)^{n+1} + \text{lower order terms} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^n}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \left(\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sin^n(t) dt - \gamma'_n 2^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \left(d(1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}) \right)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that the Hausdorff distance of $K - x$ from $\bar{B} - x$ is bounded above by $\gamma \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$ for some universal constant $\gamma > 0$. $\square$

Note Added in Proof. Theorem 10.2 has been extended to higher dimensions in recent work of Andrews-Guan-Ni by using the classical affine isoperimetric inequality and isoperimetric inequality; see [8].

Acknowledgment: I would like to thank Julian Scheuer for pointing out some errors in the proof of Lemma 9.2. I would like to thank the referees for useful comments and suggestions. The work of the author was supported by Austrian Science Fund (FWF) Project M1716-N25 and the European Research Council (ERC) Project 306445.

REFERENCES

1. A.D. Aleksandrov, Smoothness of the convex surface of bounded Gaussian curvature, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 36 (1942) 211–216.
2. B. Andrews, Contraction of convex hypersurfaces in Euclidean space, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 2 (1994) 151–171.
3. B. Andrews, Contraction of convex hypersurfaces by their affine normal, J. Differential Geom. 43 (1996) 207–230.
4. B. Andrews, Monotone quantities and unique limits for evolving convex hypersurfaces, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 1997 (1997) 1001–1031.
5. B. Andrews, Evolving convex curves, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 7 (1998) 315–371.
6. B. Andrews, Motion of hypersurfaces by Gauss curvature, Pacific J. Math. 195 (2000) 1–34.

7. B. Andrews, Classification of limiting shapes for isotropic curve flows, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 16 (2003) 443–459.
8. B. Andrews, P. Guan, L. Ni, Flow by the power of the Gauss curvature, available at arXiv:1510.00655v1.
9. S. Angenent, On the formation of singularities in the curve shortening flow, *J. Differential Geom.* 33 (1991) 601–633.
10. S. Angenent, J.J.L. Velázquez, Asymptotic shape of cusp singularities in curve shortening, *Duke Math. J.* 77 (1995) 71–110.
11. R. Bhatia, *Matrix analysis*, Vol. 169. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997.
12. T. Bonnesen, W. Fenchel, *Theorie der konvexen Körper*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1934.
13. H. Busemann, *Convex surfaces*, No. 6. Courier Dover Publications, 2012.
14. L.A. Caffarelli, A localization property of viscosity solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation and their strict convexity, *Ann. of Math.* (1990) 129–134.
15. L.A. Caffarelli, Interior $W^{2,p}$ -estimate for solutions of the Monge-Ampère equations, *Ann. of Math.* 131 (1990) 135–150.
16. S.Y. Cheng, S.T. Yau, On the regularity of the solution of the n -dimensional Minkowski problem, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 29 (1976) 495–516.
17. K.S. Chou, X.J. Wang, The L_p -Minkowski problem and the Minkowski problem in centroaffine geometry, *Adv. in Math.* 205 (2006) 33–83.
18. B. Chow, Deforming convex hypersurfaces by the n th root of the Gaussian curvature, *J. Differential Geom.* 22 (1985) 117–138.
19. B. Chow, R. Gulliver, Aleksandrov reflection and nonlinear evolution equations I: The n -sphere and n -ball, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 4 (1996) 249–264.
20. B. Chow, D.H. Tsai, Geometric expansion of convex plane curves, *J. Differential Geom.* 44 (1996) 312–330.
21. B. Chow, D.H. Tsai, Expansion of convex hypersurface by non-homogeneous functions of curvature, *Asian J. Math.* 1 (1997) 769–784.
22. B. Chow, D.H. Tsai, Nonhomogeneous Gauss curvature flows, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 47 (1998) 965–994.
23. C. Gerhardt, Non-scale-invariant inverse curvature flows in Euclidean space, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 49 (2014) 471–489.
24. P. Guan, L. Ni, Entropy and a convergence theorem for Gauss curvature flow in high dimension, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* (to appear) , available at arXiv:1306.0625 (2013) .
25. H. Guggenheimer, Applications of polarity, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 102 (1975) 369–383.
26. E.C. Gutierrez, *The Monge-Ampère equation*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications. 44. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2001.
27. D. Hug, Curvature relations and affine surface area for a general convex body and its polar, *Results Math.* 29 (1996) 233–248.
28. D. Hug, Absolute continuity for curvature measures of convex sets III, *Adv. in Math.* 169 (2002) 92–117.
29. M.N. Ivaki, An application of dual convex bodies to the inverse Gauss curvature flow, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 143 (2015) 1257–1271.
30. M.N. Ivaki, The planar Busemann–Petty centroid inequality and its stability, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* (2015) DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/tran/6503>.
31. M.N. Ivaki, Convex bodies with pinched Mahler volume under the centro-affine normal flows, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 14 (2014) 1898–1911.
32. D. Jerison, A Minkowski problem for electrostatic capacity, *Acta Math.* 176 (1996) 1–47.
33. N.V. Krylov, M.V. Safonov, Certain properties of parabolic equations with measurable coefficients, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* 40 (1981) 161–175; English transl., *Math. USSR Izv.* 16(1981) 151–164.
34. T.C. Lin, C.C. Poon, D.H. Tsai, Expanding convex immersed closed plane curves, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 34 (2009) 153–178.
35. T.C. Lin, C.C. Poon, D.H. Tsai, Contracting convex immersed closed plane curves with slow speed of curvature, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 364 (2012) 5735–5763.
36. A. Lunardi, *Analytic Semigroups and Optimal Regularity in Parabolic Problems*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.
37. E. Lutwak, On some affine isoperimetric inequalities, *J. Differential Geom.* 23 (1986) 1–13

38. E. Lutwak, The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. I. Mixed volumes and the Minkowski problem, *J. Differential Geom.* 38 (1993) 131–150.
39. M. Marini, G.D. Philippis, A note on Petty’s Theorem, *Kodai Math. J.* 37 (2014) 586–594.
40. J. McCoy, The surface area preserving mean curvature flow, *Asian J. Math.* 7 (2003) 7–30.
41. C.M. Petty, Geomiminal surface area, *Geometriae Dedicata* 3 (1974) 77–97.
42. C.M. Petty, Affine isoperimetric problems, in: J.E. Goodman, E. Lutwak, J. Malkevitch, R. Pollack (Eds.), *Discrete Geometry and Convexity*, Ann. New York Acad. Sci. 1985, pp. 113–127.
43. C.C. Poon, D.H. Tsai, Contracting convex immersed closed plane curves with fast speed of curvature, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 18 (2010) 23–75.
44. C.C. Poon, D.H. Tsai, On a nonlinear parabolic equation arising from anisotropic plane curve evolution, *J. Differ. Equ.* 258 (2015) 2375–2407.
45. E. Salowski, *Affine Differentialgeometrie*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Göschens Lehrbücherei, Band 22, 1934.
46. R. Schneider, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, Vol. 151. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
47. O. Schnürer, Surfaces expanding by the inverse Gauss curvature flow, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 600 (2006) 117–134.
48. A. Stancu, Centro-affine invariants for smooth convex bodies, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2012 (2012) 2289–2320.
49. H.D. Tsai, Blowup behavior of an equation arising from plane-curves expansion, *Differential and Integral Equations* 17 (2004) 849–872.
50. H.D. Tsai, Behavior of the gradient for solutions of parabolic equations on the circle, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 23 (2005) 251–270.
51. K. Tso, Deforming a hypersurface by its Gauss-Kronecker curvature, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 38 (1985) 867–882.
52. J. Urbas, An expansion of convex hypersurfaces, *J. Differential Geom.* 33 (1991) 91–125.
53. O. Vladimi, U. Simon, *Affine geometry and polar hypersurfaces. Analysis and geometry*, 87–112, Bibliographisches Inst., Mannheim, 1992.
54. X.P. Zhu, *Lectures on mean curvature flows*, Vol. 32. American Mathematical Society 2002.

INSTITUT FÜR DISKRETE MATHEMATIK UND GEOMETRIE, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WIEN,
 WIEDNER HAUPTSTR. 8–10, 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: mohammad.ivaki@tuwien.ac.at